

### **REMARKS**

In the January 12, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-13 stand rejected in view of prior art.

In the January 12, 2007 Office Action, all of the claims stand rejected in view of prior art.

No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

#### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the January 12, 2007 Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 1, has and cancelled claim 4 as indicated above. Applicant has also amended claims 5-7 and 9 for form. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-3 and 5-13 are pending, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

#### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

In items 3-14 of the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0032251 (Rhoads). In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to define clearly the present invention over the prior art of record, and has cancelled claim 4.

In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the supplemental information management server allocates new identifying information to updated documents having changed contents, requests or allows updates to stored supplemental information associated with pre-update identifying information, and indicates use to the supplemental information acquisition device of a pre-updated document and existence of the updated documents. Further, amended claim 1 also now recites the supplemental information acquisition device indicates on the display unit use of a pre-updated document and existence

of the updated documents. Some of these limitations were recited in original claim 4. The additional limitations that were not recited in original claim 4 include:

the display unit of the supplemental information acquisition device;

the supplemental information management server indicating use of a pre-updated document and existence of updated documents to the supplemental information acquisition device; and

the supplemental information acquisition device indicates on the display unit use of the pre-updated document and the existence of the updated documents.

In item 7 of the Office Action, it is stated that paragraph [0036] of Rhoads discloses the limitations of claim 4. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Rhoads discloses updating a database with new and current information, and fails to disclose or to suggest indicating that updated document exist and that the document being used is a pre-updated one. In other words, Applicant respectfully asserts that when the document itself is changed or updated, Rhoads fails to disclose or to suggest indicating the use of a pre-updated document because all of the changes are on the database side. In short, Rhoads fails to disclose or to suggest a mechanism by which a holder of a document, in this case a business card, can know of the existence of an updated card.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the recited structure is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent 3-5 and 8-13 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable

for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 1, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In items 16-18 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0032251 (Rhoads) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,382 (Bowman-Amuah). In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 as mentioned above.

More specifically, as stated independent claim 1 now clearly recites that the supplemental information management server allocates new identifying information to updated documents having changed contents, requests or allows updates to stored supplemental information associated with pre-update identifying information, and indicates use to the supplemental information acquisition device of a pre-updated document and existence of the updated documents. Further, amended claim 1 also now recites the supplemental information acquisition device indicates on the display unit use of a pre-updated document and existence of the updated documents.

Applicant believes that the Rhoads reference does not anticipate or suggest the recited limitations of claim 1 for the reasons stated above. Applicant respectfully asserts that Bowman-Amuah was cited to show that when a managed document has been deleted, the supplemental information management server requests or allows the stored supplemental information associated with the deleted document to be updated or to update automatically.

Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that Bowman-Amuah fails to disclose or to suggest a supplemental information acquisition device having a display unit that displays use of a pre-updated document and the existence of updated documents when the supplemental information management server indicates use of the pre-updated document and existence of updated documents.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the recited arrangement of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does not make the modification obvious, unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicant's unique arrangement of a supplemental information dissemination system.

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent claims 6 and 7 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-3 and 5-13 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/707,013  
Amendment dated April 11, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Todd M. Guise  
Reg. No. 46,748

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: 4/11/07  
S:\04-APR07-YS\KM\US030555 Amendment.doc